1	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
2	In the Matter of)
4)
5	MUR 6018) CASE CLOSURE UNDER THE
6	FRIENDS TO ELECT GEORGE E.) ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM
7	MITCHELL FOR CONGRESS, AND)
8 9	ROSALIND MITCHELL,) AS TREASURER)
10	AS INLASORER)
11	
12	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT
13	Under the Enforcement Priority System, matters that are low-rated
14	are
15	forwarded to the Commission with a recommendation for dismissal. The Commission has
16	determined that pursuing low-rated matters compared to other higher rated matters on the
17	Enforcement docket warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss these
18	Cases.
19	The Office of General Counsel scored MUR 6018 as a low-rated matter. In this case,
20	the Complainant, Elaine Sawyer, alleges that Friends to Elect George E. Mitchell for
21	Congress Committee ("Committee") and Rosalind Mitchell, as treasurer, violated various
22	reporting provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended.
23	Specifically, complainant alleges that the Committee's disclosure reports are inaccurate,
24	because they show disbursements to the candidate's former employer, Sawyer & Associates
25	Real Estate, Inc., ("Sawyer Real Estate") for the rental of office space. The complainant
26	alleges that Sawyer Real Estate did not receive any funds from the Committee. Rather,
27	Sawyer Real Estate received \$1,000 per month from the candidate for administrative fees
28	pursuant to a Broker-Agent Independent Contractor Agreement.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

ı

14)

422

904

In response to the complaint the candidate states that he was never an employee for Sawyer Real Estate. Instead, the candidate claims that he paid \$1,000 per month for the use of office space at Sawyer Real Estate.\(^1\) According to the complainant, the \$1,000 per month that was paid by him, on behalf of his Committee, to Sawyer Real Estate was with the understanding that his Committee would conduct activities at the office. Moreover, the candidate claims that the motive behind the complainant's complaint could be to avoid having the rent payments documented, since the complainant is under an Internal Revenue Service investigation and is involved in a law suit with her former business partner.

The expenses associated with the alleged reporting violations appear to be de minimis. Thus, in furtherance of the Commission's priorities and resources, relative to other matters pending on the Enforcement docket, the Office of General Counsel believes that the Commission should exercise its prosecutorial discretion and dismiss the matter. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).

RECOMMENDATION

The Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission diamiss

MUR 6018, close the file, and approve the appropriate letters.

The parties are in dispute over the exact amount that was paid by the candidate for either rent or administrative expenses, since it appears that the candidate offset some of the monthly expenses from an earned commission that allegedly was not credited by Sawyer Real Estate. The candidate states that he is involved in a civil lawsuit with Sawyer Real Estate over the real estate commission.

Thomasenia P. Duncan
General Counsel

Gregory R. Baker
Special Counsel
Complaints Examination
& Legal Administration

Jeff S. Jordan
Supervisory Attorney
Complaints Examination
& Legal Administration

Shana M. Broussard
Attorney